

Program B: Human Resource Management

Program Authorization: La. Constitution, Article X

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The mission of the Human Resource Management Program is to promote effective human resource management throughout state government by developing and implementing systems for job evaluation, pay, employment, promotion and personnel management and by administering these systems through rules, policies, and practices that encourage wise utilization of the state's financial and human resources.

The goals of the Human Resource Management Program are:

1. Improve the classification and compensation systems through the development and implementation of flexible job evaluation and pay policies and practices that can be adapted to meet agencies' unique requirements.
2. Create and administer programs, rules, and procedures that promote effectiveness and accountability in state agencies and their employees.
3. Provide hiring and promotion processes to make qualified candidates available for timely employment and promotion decision for state managers.
4. Develop the capabilities of agency supervisors and human resource managers to assume greater responsibilities over the management of human resources through training and other activities.

The Human Resource Management Program includes the following activities: Personnel Management, Classification and Pay, and Examining Divisions.

- The Personnel Management Division reviews, develops, and implements Civil Service rules, processes all personnel actions, performs investigations, reviews agency contracts, reviews agency layoffs, maintains the state personnel manual, performs statewide education and training of personnel staff member and supervisory personnel, monitors and provides guidance regarding relevant federal regulations, reviews and accepts or denies performance appraisal programs, staffs special requests to the director of civil service and the Civil Service Commission, audits agency human resource programs, and issues general circulars and transmittals.
- The Classification and Pay Division establishes job evaluation and pay policies, performs position audits, writes job specifications, performs job studies and class reviews, establishes new jobs and positions, performs compensation studies and recommends pay adjustments, and allocates and reallocates positions.
- The Examining Division recruits, tests, and certifies applicants for state employment.

OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Unless otherwise indicated, all objectives are to be accomplished during or by the end of FY 2000-2001. Performance indicators are made up of two parts: name and value. The indicator name describes what is being measured. The indicator value is the numeric value or level achieved within a given measurement period. For budgeting purposes, performance indicator values are shown for the prior fiscal year, the current fiscal year, and alternative funding scenarios (continuation budget level and Executive Budget recommendation level) for the ensuing fiscal year (the fiscal year of the budget document).

The objectives and performance indicators that appear below are associated with program funding in the Base Executive Budget for FY 2000-01. Specific information on program funding is presented in the financial sections that follow performance tables.

1. (KEY) Through the Personnel Management activity, to continue a quality assurance program to monitor the performance planning and review system that was implemented on July 1, 1997.

Strategic Link: This operational objective is related to Strategic Objective II.2: *By June 30, 2000, develop and implement a quality assurance program to monitor the performance planning and review system that was implemented on July 1, 1997.*

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of agency visits conducted ¹	12	9 ²	Not applicable ³	18 ³	6	6
K	Number of hours spent evaluating agency reports ¹	Not applicable ⁴	288	Not applicable ⁴	150 ⁴	195	195

¹ Agency visits include refresher classes taught on site, special presentations to agencies, and technical assistance visits. The agency visits and report evaluations enable the department to evaluate the quality of the performance planning and review system in each agency and statewide. In prior fiscal years, during which the performance planning and review system was being implemented, a performance indicator entitled "Number of employees rated using performance planning and review system" was used to measure implementation progress. With implementation of the system among state agencies accomplished, the department has moved to indicators that gauge department efforts to evaluate the quality of the system.

² Travel freeze resulting from Executive Order MJF 99-1 and demands of ISIS-HR on department staff prevented attainment of performance standard.

³ This performance indicator appeared under Act 19 of 1998 and had a performance standard for FY 1998-99. However, the indicator did not appear under Act 10 of 1999 and does not have a performance standard for FY 1999-00. The value shown for existing performance standard is an estimate not a standard.

⁴ This is a new performance indicator that did not appear under Act 19 of 1998 or Act 10 of 1999. It does not have a performance standard for FY 1998-99 or FY 1999-00. The value shown for existing performance standard is an estimate not a standard.

2. (KEY) Through the Personnel Management activity, to offer different training courses at various times and various instructional sites across the state, with each course achieving at least a 95% satisfaction rating.

Strategic Link: This operational objective is related to Strategic Objective IV.1: *Increase the capabilities of agency supervisors and human resource managers by offering training courses at various instructional sites across the state, with each course achieving at least a 95% student satisfaction rating.*

Explanatory Note: Three primary courses offered are: "Civil Service Rules and Regulations for Supervisors," "Key Elements of Civil Service Disciplinary Actions," and "Performance Planning and Review for Supervisors." Other courses, such as "Training for Human Resource Professionals," are taught as needed. In addition, extensive training will be required to implement the ISIS Human Resource Information System (see Program A, Objective 4) that is scheduled for implementation by October 31, 2000.

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Total number of students instructed	1,460 ¹	2,810	1,457	1,457	3,000 ²	3,000 ²
K	Total number of classes offered	Not applicable ³	97	64	64	100 ²	100 ²
K	Average percentage of students satisfied with instruction	95% ¹	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%

¹ Although this performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 of 1998, the nature of the indicator (aggregate of other Act 19 indicators) is such that it is possible to calculate a FY 1998-99 performance standard value.

² The total number of students instructed and total number of classes offered are expected to increase dramatically in FY 2000-01 because so much training will have to be done in order to implement the ISIS Human Resource Information System. In addition, all training done by the department will be recorded in these performance indicators; in the past some training was reported under other objectives (for example, training related to delegation of classification was previously reported under a different objective).

³ This was a new performance indicator for FY 1999-00. It did not appear under Act 19 of 1998 and has no FY 1998-99 performance standard.

3. (SUPPORTING) Through the Personnel Management activity, to monitor and evaluate programs that allow more effective use of contingent workforce.

Strategic Link: This operational objective is related to Strategic Objective II.1: *By June 30, 2001, design and implement programs to allow more effective use of contingent workforce.*

Explanatory Note: Contingent workforce is temporary staffing. The Department of State Civil Service has conducted a pilot program allowing the use of private temporary staffing services in selected state agencies. Since the design and implementation of a program to allow more effective use of contingent workforce has been completed, the department is now targeting and measuring progress toward monitoring and evaluation of this new program. The number of agencies using the contingent workforce program is expected to be 35 or more by the end of FY 1999-00.

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Number of people hired through contingent workforce program	Not applicable ¹	Not available ¹	500 ¹	500 ¹	1,200	1,200
S	Number of agencies using the contingent workforce program	Not applicable ²	45	25 ²	25 ²	50	50
S	Percentage of agencies reporting satisfaction with temporary hires	Not applicable ³	Not available ³	95%	95%	80% ⁴	80% ⁴

¹ This performance indicator was a new performance indicator for FY 1999-00. It did not appear under Act 19 of 1998 and has no FY 1998-99 performance standard. Performance information related to this indicator was not tracked during FY 1998-99 because the program was in the design and initial pilot stages. The program has been more successful than originally anticipated. In its FY 1999-00 Second Quarter Performance Progress Report, the department indicated that 1,175 people were hired through the contingent workforce program, during the first half of FY 1999-00.

² This performance indicator was new for FY 1999-00. It did not appear under Act 19 of 1998 and has no FY 1998-99 performance standard. In its FY 1999-00 First Quarter Performance Progress Report, the department indicated that it currently expects the yearend figure for this indicator to be 35.

³ This performance indicator was new for FY 1999-00. It did not appear under Act 19 of 1998 and has no FY 1998-99 performance standard. Performance information related to this indicator was not tracked during FY 1998-99 because the program was in the design and initial pilot stages.

⁴ A lower percentage of agencies reporting satisfaction with temporary hires in FY 2000-01 than in FY 1999-00 is due to the increased volume of temporary hires that is expected in FY 2000-01. This greater volume carries a risk for more unsatisfactory situations resulting from temporary hires.

4. (KEY) Through the Classification and Pay activity, to implement pay practices that are more responsive to agencies' needs for increased flexibility in organization design and employee compensation as well as policies and/or rules that allow agencies to reward individuals or groups of employees for significant achievements.

Strategic Link: This operational objective is related to Strategic Goal I: *Improve the classification and compensation systems through the development and implementation of flexible job evaluation and pay policies and practices which can be adapted to meet agencies' unique requirements.* It is also related to Strategic Objective I.1 (*By June 30, 2000, develop and implement policies and/or rules that allow agencies to reward individuals or groups of employees based upon significant achievement.*) and Strategic Objective I.3 (*By June 30, 2003, identify and implement pay practices, such as dual tracking, that are more responsive to agencies' needs for more flexibility in organization design and employee compensation, as measured by their usage of the new options.*)

Explanatory Note: In 1997 the Civil Service Commission adopted and the Governor approved new rules and regulations to encourage agencies to reward employees. The new rules give agencies flexibility to develop internal policies to recognize employees or employee teams for significant achievement or performance. This recognition would allow for a one-time annual supplement that would not be included in the employee's base salary. The new rule took effect July 1, 1998. In April 1999 the Civil Service Commission passed and the Governor approved a new rule allowing agencies to use dual career ladders to meet their needs for increased flexibility in their organizations. In June 1999 the Civil Service Commission passed and the Governor approved new rules allowing for additional pay flexibility.

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of policies using new flexible options approved by the Civil Service Commission during fiscal year	Not applicable ¹	13	10	10	10	10

¹ This was a new performance indicator for FY 1999-00. It did not appear under Act 19 of 1998 and has no FY 1998-99 performance standard.

5. (KEY) Through the Classification and Pay activity, to complete or review at least 24 salary surveys.

Strategic Link: This operational objective is related to Strategic Objective I.2: *Regularly review market pay levels in the private sector and comparable governmental entities in order to make yearly recommendations to the Civil Service Commission and the governor concerning pay levels to assure that state salaries are competitive.*

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of salary surveys completed or reviewed ¹	24	34 ²	24 ³	24 ³	24	24

¹ Completed" refers to salary surveys conducted by the department; "reviewed" refers to salary surveys in which the department used the work of others.

² In FY 1998-99, the department received more salary survey requests than usual and was able to respond to them; consequently, the results of the surveys were sent to the department for review.

³ In FY 1999-00, the department received \$140,000 from the cabinet undersecretaries to complete a comprehensive salary survey of jobs within the State of Louisiana. This survey will be completed by March 30, 2000.

6. (SUPPORTING) Through the Classification and Pay activity, to ensure uniformity of the statewide classification plan by reviewing the allocation of 12% of all classified positions and conducting 125 on-site classification audits annually.

Strategic Link: This operational objective is related to Strategic Objective II.3: *By June 30, 2003, to provide mechanisms to better evaluate agency compliance with merit system principles, Civil Service Rules and policies in making employment decisions.*

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Percentage of classified positions reviewed	Not applicable ¹	19%	Not applicable ¹	10% ¹	12% ¹	12% ¹
S	Number of on-site classification audits conducted	Not applicable ²	101	Not applicable ²	100 ²	125	125

¹ This is a new performance indicator. It did not appear under Act 19 of 1998 or Act 10 of FY 1999-00 and has no performance standards for FY 1998-99 and FY 1999-00. The value shown for existing performance standard is an estimate not a standard. With ISIS-Human Resource Management System implementation issues and the implementation of new pay rules, fewer department resources will be available for position allocation review. The total number of position allocations reviewed will go down for a period of time and then increase when adjustment to all the change has occurred.

² This is a new performance indicator. It did not appear under Act 19 of 1998 or Act 10 of 1999 and has no performance standards for FY 1998-99 and FY 1999-00. The value shown for existing performance standard is an estimate not a standard. Given the travel restrictions that have been imposed on the department (due to limited funding and Executive Order MJF 99-1 freeze), the department has been unable to complete the number of desk audits anticipated in FY 1998-99 and FY 1999-00. However, the number of on-site audits was not a performance indicator in those years.

7. (SUPPORTING) Through the Classification and Pay activity, to hold the average job study processing time to 160 days if the department receives no more than 450 job study requests and completes no more than 400 job studies.

Strategic Link: This operational objective is related to Strategic Objective I.5: *Improve average job study time to 120 days by June 30, 2001.*

Explanatory Note: Job study refers to the process of researching and analyzing task, market, agency information concerning a group of related tasks within one or more jobs to determine how and to what degree there is change and what State Civil Service should do to accommodate that change. Continually, the department is asked, and it decides on its own, to study certain jobs--most frequently because salaries have fallen below market to such an extent that retention of trained employees is threatened. As more studies are requested on the basis of salary, the more urgent the need for pay plan revision becomes. The operational objective above is predicated on the receipt of no more than 450 job study requests and completion of no more than 400 job studies in the fiscal year. Unless the department is able to control the number of job studies submitted in FY 1999-00 and FY 2000-01, the processing time will increase significantly because of the resources that must be dedicated to the ISIS Human Resources Project. The department will not be able to complete the number of studies completed in FY 1998-99.

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Number of job study requests received	Not applicable ¹	343	Not applicable ¹	450 ¹	450	450
S	Number of job studies completed	450	589	525	525	400	400
S	Average processing time for job studies (in days)	160	189 ²	160	160	160	160

¹ This performance indicator was new for FY 1999-00. It did not appear under Act 19 of 1998 and has no FY 1998-99 performance standard. The value shown for existing performance standard is an estimate not a standard.

² The hiring freeze in FY 1998-99 (pursuant to Executive Order MJF 99-1) was the primary cause of the increase in the average processing time for job studies.

8. (KEY) Through the Examining activity, to maintain at least a 94% service satisfaction rating among applicants taking pre-employment tests for state employment.

Strategic Link: This operational objective is related to Strategic Objective: *By June 30, 2003, implement a program of expanded service to applicants through use of computer technology, job fairs, Job Service capabilities, and newspaper advertising to improve citizen access to state employment.*

Explanatory Note: Progress toward accomplishing this objective will be measured by the change in number of test administrations and number of testing sessions as well as the satisfaction rating of applicants.

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of test administrations	Not applicable ¹	23,764	30,000 ²	30,000 ²	20,000	20,000
K	Number of testing sessions - Weekday	Not applicable ¹	624	600	600	600	600
K	Number of testing sessions - Saturday	Not applicable ¹	105	105	105	105	105
K	Percentage of satisfied applicants ³	Not applicable ¹	98	94%	94%	94%	94%

¹ This was a new performance indicator for FY 1999-00. It did not appear under Act 19 of 1998 and has no FY 1998-99 performance standard.

² The performance standard of 30,000 was set but should have been revised to 20,000 to reflect the actual level of funding for the department.

³ See general performance data for actual number of applicants in FY 1994-95 through FY 1998-99.

GENERAL PERFORMANCE INFORMATION: EXAMINING ACTIVITY					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1994-95	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1995-96	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1996-97	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1997-98	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1998-99
Number of applicants ¹	89,038	72,094	62,448	55,400	53,400
Number of tests administered	35,655	29,566	29,512	20,063	23,764
Number of certificates issued	6,242	5,009	5,073	6,120	6,628

¹The number of applicants has continued to decline because of the state's low unemployment rate and the noncompetitive salaries for state jobs. In addition, hundreds of written examinations have been consolidated into 15. This means that before consolidation a person may have submitted five applications to apply for 20 jobs; now he/she submits only one. Finally, walk-in testing has eliminated the counting and processing of absent applicants because there are none.

9. (KEY) Through the Examining activity, to strengthen validity evidence for exams by completing at least two validity studies during the fiscal year.

Strategic Link: This operational objective is related to Strategic Objective III.2: *Strengthen validity evidence for exams by completing at least two validity studies each year through June 30, 2003.*

Explanatory Note: Criterion-related validity refers to the relationship between test score and job performance. A study of criterion-related validity produces a correlation coefficient; the higher the correlation, the stronger the relationship between test score and job performance. The Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection require validation of tests used to place employees and the courts have consistently supported professional validation of exams in the public sector. Criterion-related validation is most important for any employment testing program because it shows that those with higher test scores will perform best, and it is the best performers whom employers are seeking. The higher the correlation coefficient for an exam, the more likely the exam can be defended successfully.

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of exams validated during the fiscal year ¹	2	1	2	2	2	2

¹ The name of this performance indicator has been changed from "number of consolidated exams validated uring fiscal year." This change was made for clarity purposes. Sometimes the exam may be for only one job; consequently, the exam would not be consolidated.

RESOURCE ALLOCATION FOR THE PROGRAM

	ACTUAL 1998-1999	ACT 10 1999- 2000	EXISTING 1999- 2000	CONTINUATION 2000 - 2001	RECOMMENDED 2000 - 2001	RECOMMENDED OVER/(UNDER) EXISTING
MEANS OF FINANCING:						
STATE GENERAL FUND (Direct)	\$0	\$0	\$5,000	\$75,496	\$0	(\$5,000)
STATE GENERAL FUND BY:						
Interagency Transfers	3,022,392	3,079,104	3,079,104	3,079,104	3,360,714	281,610
Fees & Self-gen. Revenues	181,269	203,577	203,577	203,577	218,399	14,822
Statutory Dedications	0	0	0	0	0	0
Interim Emergency Board	0	0	0	0	0	0
FEDERAL FUNDS	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL MEANS OF FINANCING	\$3,203,661	\$3,282,681	\$3,287,681	\$3,358,177	\$3,579,113	\$291,432
EXPENDITURES & REQUEST:						
Salaries	\$2,521,653	\$2,694,312	\$2,694,312	\$2,760,120	\$2,888,425	\$194,113
Other Compensation	86,159	37,480	37,480	37,480	37,480	0
Related Benefits	441,560	427,386	427,386	436,467	487,705	60,319
Total Operating Expenses	59,374	43,503	43,503	44,110	65,503	22,000
Professional Services	94,915	80,000	85,000	80,000	100,000	15,000
Total Other Charges	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Acq. & Major Repairs	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES AND REQUEST	\$3,203,661	\$3,282,681	\$3,287,681	\$3,358,177	\$3,579,113	\$291,432
AUTHORIZED FULL-TIME EQUIVALENTS: Classified	76	76	76	76	82	6
Unclassified	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	76	76	76	76	82	6

SOURCE OF FUNDING

In accordance with R.S. 42:1383 this program is funded with State General Fund, Interagency Transfers from all state budget units with classified employees, and Fees and Self-generated Revenues from non-budgeted and ancillary state agencies with classified employees. This funding approach maximizes the utilization of non-general fund support for the program.

ANALYSIS OF RECOMMENDATION

GENERAL FUND	TOTAL	T.O.	DESCRIPTION
\$0	\$3,282,681	76	ACT 10 FISCAL YEAR 1999-2000
			BA-7 TRANSACTIONS:
\$5,000	\$5,000	0	Carry forward to provide for the balance of a professional services contract for development and validation of two written examinations
\$5,000	\$3,287,681	76	EXISTING OPERATING BUDGET – December 3, 1999
\$0	\$24,963	0	Annualization of FY 1999-2000 Classified State Employees Merit Increase
\$0	\$38,346	0	Classified State Employees Merit Increases for FY 2000-2001
\$0	\$18,998	0	State Employee Retirement Rate Adjustment
(\$5,000)	(\$5,000)	0	Non-Recurring Carry Forwards
\$0	\$42,507	0	Salary Base Adjustment
\$0	(\$94,346)	0	Attrition Adjustment
\$0	\$11,580	0	Other Adjustments - Training series adjustments
\$0	\$254,384	6	Other Adjustments - ISIS/Human Resources/Payroll project
\$0	\$3,579,113	82	TOTAL RECOMMENDED
\$0	\$0	0	LESS GOVERNOR'S SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS
\$0	\$3,579,113	82	BASE EXECUTIVE BUDGET FISCAL YEAR 2000-2001
			SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS CONTINGENT ON SALES TAX RENEWAL:
\$0	\$0	0	None
\$0	\$0	0	TOTAL SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS CONTINGENT ON SALES TAX RENEWAL

SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS CONTINGENT ON NEW REVENUE:			
\$0	\$0	0	None
\$0	\$0	0	TOTAL SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS CONTINGENT ON NEW REVENUE
\$0	\$3,579,113	82	GRAND TOTAL RECOMMENDED

The total means of financing for this program is recommended at 108.9% of the existing operating budget. It represents 89.7% of the total request (\$3,989,300) for this program. The increased funding is due to increases for the ISIS/Human Resources/Payroll project and in the retirement rate adjustment.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

\$80,000	Test validation consultant
\$20,000	Consultant for ISIS/Human Resources/Payroll project
\$100,000	TOTAL PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

OTHER CHARGES

This program does not have funding for Other Charges for Fiscal Year 2000-2001

ACQUISITIONS AND MAJOR REPAIRS

This program does not have funding for Acquisitions and Major Repairs for Fiscal Year 2000-2001